REMARKS

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to further specify different embodiments of the present invention and overcome the rejection. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by the amended claim. All claims are now present for examination and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following comments.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112 FIRST PARAGRAPH:

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection has been overcome by the currently resented amendment. More specifically, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the ratio as a ratio of the total of the display-on periods of all of the subfields including the first and second subfields to the one field is in the range from 1:6 to 5:6. This amendment is supported by the several examples in the specification. One example is CASE 1, on page 1, line 7 through page 12, line 5. In TABLE 2, "the total of the display-on periods of all of the subfields including the first and second subfields" is 0.05 x 1 (B'0) + 0.09 x 1 (B'1) + 0.18 x 1 (B'2) + 0.36 x 1 (B'3) + 0.36 x 2 (B'4) + 0.36 x 4 (B'5), and "the one field" is 1.43 (B'0) + 1.47 (B'1) + 1.56 (B'2) + 1.74 (B'3) + 3.48 (B'4) + 6.96 x 4 (B'5). Therefore, there is adequate written description in the specification with regard to the embodiments defined in Claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) as allegedly being anticipated by the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that the present-claimed invention is not anticipated by the cited reference. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that AAPA (FIG. 9, subfields B2 and B3) teaches the second subfield having a plurality of display-off periods for which the liquid crystal is not driven and a plurality of display-on periods for which the liquid crystal is driven. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation. As shown in the attached illustrative drawings FIG. 9 (AAPA) and FIG. 10 (the present invention), there are clear and significant differences between prior art and the present invention. In particular, each of the subfields B2 and B3 shown in FIG. 9 has only one display-off period and also only one display-on period, which is true from TABLE 1 on page 6. In contrast, each of the subfields B'4 and B'5 (the claimed first and second subfields) has a plurality of display-off periods and a plurality of display-on periods, which is true from TABLE 2 on pages 11 and 12. Therefore, the embodiments of the present invention as claimed are different from AAPA.

In summary, the newly presented claims are not anticipated by AAPA and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over the alleged applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Chen (US 2003/0080931).

Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that the embodiments of present-claimed invention are not obvious over the cited prior art references. More specifically, Claim 3 include all the features of Claim 1 and the significant differences between the present invention and AAPA have been described above and shown in the attached illustrative drawings. In addition, the difference between the present invention and Chen have been discussed in the previous response.

According to MPEP 2143.01, the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). According to MPEP 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). It is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation to combine AAPA with Chen, and even if they are combined, they will not lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to the present invention as currently defined.

Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Having overcome all outstanding grounds of rejection, the application is now in condition for allowance, and prompt action toward that end is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By _____
John C. Holman
Registration No. 22,769

Date: June 18, 2007
(202) 638-6666
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Atty. Dkt. No.: P69141US0

Enclosure:

Illustrative Drawings (2 pages)